IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE COLUMBIA DIVISION

RAYMOND WATISON,	
Plaintiff,)
) NO. 1:20-cv-00081
v.)
) JUDGE CAMPBELL
GRADY PERRY, et al.,) MAGISTRATE JUDGE HOLMES
)
Defendants.)
	OPPER

ORDER

Pending before the Court is the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 72), which was filed on November 7, 2022. Through the Report and Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge recommends that Defendant Carter be dismissed under Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for lack of service of process, that Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Doc. No. 60) be denied, and that the motion for summary judgment filed by Defendants Grady Perry, Tyler Barnett, Michelle Carpenter, Larry Coleman, Tina Tarnowski, and Bethanie White (Doc. No. 47) be granted and this action be dismissed with prejudice as to all claims. On November 30, 2022, the Court received Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendation. (See Doc. No. 73).

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Rule 72.02, a district court reviews *de novo* any portion of a report and recommendation to which a specific objection is made. *United States v. Curtis*, 237 F.3d 598, 603 (6th Cir. 2001). General or conclusory objections are insufficient. *See Zimmerman v. Cason*, 354 F. Appx. 228, 230 (6th Cir. 2009). Thus, "only those specific objections to the magistrate's report made to the district court will be preserved for appellate review." *Id.* (quoting *Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Teachers*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987)). In conducting

the review, the court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Here, Plaintiff's objections do not identify any factual or legal errors on the part of Judge Holmes in making her determinations. Objections which do not identify an error are meritless. *See Howard v. Sec. of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991). Accordingly,

Plaintiff's objections fail to state viable grounds to challenge Judge Holmes' conclusions or

otherwise provide a basis to reject or modify the Report and Recommendation.

Having reviewed the Report and Recommendation and considered Plaintiff's objections, the Court concludes that the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 72) should be adopted and approved. Accordingly, Defendant Carter is **DISMISSED** under Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for lack of service of process; Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Doc. No. 60) is **DENIED**; and Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Doc. No. 47) is **GRANTED**

and this action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice as to all claims.

It is so **ORDERED**.

WILLIAM L. CAMPBELL, JR.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE